

CALFED Independent Science Board

Meeting Summary

CALFED Bay-Delta Program
650 Capitol Mall, 5th Floor, Delta Room
Conference Call
April 9, 2007, 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

ISB Attendance:

CALFED Office: Jeff Mount, Lead Scientist Mike Healey
Via phone: Daene McKinney, Duncan Patten, Paul Smith, Dick Norgaard, Peter Goodwin, Judy Meyer, Bill Glaze, Bob Twiss, Antonio Baptista

Absent: Jack Keller

Introductions

Mount: This is our first attempt at a conference call, and we have a short agenda, to reduce the time we spend at our meetings and also to deal with the very fluid environment which is CALFED these days, things changing constantly, and to keep board members informed and get their input on issues.

There were no changes for disclosures of Board members.

On the letter regarding PPIC report, Jeff received no formal comment regarding letter, but did get lots of "unofficial comments." The key was the important highlights the letter made of the deficiencies of the PPIC report, e.g., water quality.

Delta Risk Management Strategy (DRMS) Phase 1 report: Ladd Lougee has developed a quality independent review group. DRMS could not meet Phase 1 deadline, so there will be no review in June. Phase 2 report to continue on schedule without Phase 1 report.

Information from the Delta Regional Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Plan (DRERIP) will also not be ready for review in June.

ISB Strategic Plan

Overview discussion: At February meeting we discussed developing a strategic plan to deal with "loss of relevance" of the ISB. It was decided that strategic plan should be developed to address relevance and priority of efforts. We will have a plan from Healey and Mount to look at for June meeting.

Mount: Would like to see ISB move away from oversight only function — principally reactive, and not a National Science Academy model. While we will have to continue doing this function, we should look at new functions of foresight and insight (better than earlier term "proactive"). Such a function would emphasize making recommendations, e.g., absence of water quality in PPIC report. There is an important need for this

foresight/insight. However, there are many things that the Board does not need to do. A new structure/model for the ISB could have individual ISB members being involved in reviews rather than the current model of the entire ISB reviewing.

Mount: Should we reexamine the ISB in terms of scope? The scope should be the state of CA and not limited to the Delta. Should we be advocating a change to the ISB scope for example, the intersection of science and policy?

Healey: Encouraged Mount on moving the ISB towards focusing on a few items. Those subjects would come from the Lead Scientist.

Mount: Key to the earlier configurations of the ISB, the Lead Scientist was the director of, and brought questions to the ISB. Lead Scientist provided direction to the ISB and Mount would like to return to this earlier model that was dropped during the period of reconstitution.

Healey: Watching how the ISB uses its time should also be a high priority in your decision making about a future ISB.

Lead Scientist Recruitment

Mount: This is a really pressing issue! We must resolve quickly and have a candidate list by June. Timeline: Selection committee in June, by end of summer recommendations to the CALFED director. Emails should be sent to ISB members to get recruitments. Reply directly to Mount with suggestions.

Smith: Defining the nature of the position, its permanence, and the salary is difficult.

Healey: To address concerns about nature of position, I will develop a one page sheet explaining the position (ACTION ITEM). We cannot get guarantee from governor that the position will be around for three or more years. However, Healey is confident that the position will be around for many years because the issues will be. This is a very dynamic and important position. It is one of the most critical positions for water policy in the West.

Meyer: Say something about the vetting process for candidates. We would like to comment on the list that is developed. For example, I have a list that I wanted to run past ISB members to see if my suggestions were appropriate.

Mount: I will develop a list and then get feedback from ISB members about it with the purpose of filtering the list to a short qualified list for the June Meeting. ISB members can also talk to those that are best and this will also filter the list to present to the committee. At urging of Meyer, Mount will develop a full list for the entire ISB to review. Comments should be individually made to Mount.

Healey: Curious about early comments about why some thought the first list was not good, or why those on the list would not be good.

Patten: Some of the members on the early list seemed inappropriate because their stature seems too high or out of place for the CALFED Program. It seemed unrealistic to expect to recruit them.

Baptista: Also thought the list had people that were over qualified for the position. Further, Baptista finds it difficult to promote the position of Lead Scientist, because he does not understand it either.

Healey: Regarding the academic connection of the position, Director Grindstaff is approaching the UC president's office to add value to hiring an academic.

Mount: Will follow up with an email and develop a recruitment list for June (ACTION ITEM).

Healey: if we don't have a list by June, we can not have a new Lead Scientist by January.

Science Program Updates - Michael Healey

(see PowerPoint slides on web)

IEP Chief Scientist - People have generally agreed that it would be appropriate to house that person within the Science Program. It is important for the Science Program to be the critical source of information and that the program synthesizes information for decision-makers. The Agency Directors have not yet signed on to this Chief Scientist concept.

Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) Chief Scientist and Science Advisors -

This is a similar issue to IEP where we're proposing a chief scientist be housed within the Science Program. That person would manage BDCP science needs and work with a small set of advisors to help BDCP. Being within the Science Program allows a more active connection with the Delta Vision process and other ongoing programs.

Delta Vision Science Advice - Mount and Healey were named science advisors to the Delta Vision. They will not provide all the science but will be a communication node. Healey confirmed with Executive Director John Kirlin that the ISB can be proactive as well as reactive.

- An important issue is water quality: we have agreed to work on water quality, and the definition of a "variable delta."
- Kirlin asked if the Science Program could establish methods for assessing vision scenarios. Healey stated that the Science Program could, but would need to define what that means. Kirlin was maybe talking about a quick assessment of the viability through "expert opinion" to determine if a vision scenario is possible or the wrong path. It will be important to inform the Task Force that such opinions are not peer reviewed and do not have equal weight.

The Science Program continues to be the scientific information node. Healey will be asking the ISB to assist with these things as they develop. When the ISB looks at its

strategic plan, the issues defined here may be some of the items the ISB should look at for priorities and relevance.

Mount: I see these as particularly important roles.

Twiss: It's a good time to develop or influence the scenarios that are being developed. For example, being explicit about how a scenario should lead to the desired result is important to make them more robust.

Meyer: Also how one gets from here to there should be defined in scenarios. I also like housing the chief scientists.

Healey: Delta Vision wants to bring scientist into their meetings so they can become comfortable with the group. As we are trying to be proactive, ISB members maybe tasked with making a presentation to the Delta Vision group as well.

State of Science Update:

There is a new report outline with a deadline in June. The authors are working on short chapters and technical editors hope to finalize products for June. We will provide intermediate, un-refereed products to Delta Vision Task Force and BDCP. For this work to have influence on the Delta Vision and BDCP processes we must be willing to let these groups see early chapters if we think that can help the Delta Vision process or BDCP group. Want ISB feedback on this process.

Meyer: There is a concern that if the material changes much, it could look bad for us in front of high level people.

Healey: I don't see a concern because the authors are familiar with the topics. I don't anticipate large changes to the final product.

Norgaard: Maybe have the closest board members for that chapter review before sending out to Delta Vision and BDCP.

Healey: Members would be asked to review 10-12 pages in a subject area you are familiar, and tell us within 72 hours whether there are serious flaws that would prevent us from distributing to the Delta Vision and BDCP. Anticipate this occurring in May (ACTION ITEM).

Twiss: Maybe we should develop a list of overview documents, e.g., the Science in Action briefs: "demystifying the delta", "mercury." I see it as briefing from a basis rather than always briefing from new material.

Washington D.C. trip - There is a proposed follow up science briefing to Jason Peltier, Mark Limbaugh and others in DC late June - In March, Healey visited people in Washington D.C. with USGS staff and told them what we are doing. While it was interesting for Washington to hear about how the Science Program was working, Peltier

wanted a briefing about the actual science that was coming out of the Science Program and the CALFED process. Healey agreed to return with a presentation towards the end of June. We could use part of the *State of Science* report as the background for the briefing. We need to formalize the briefing and who will present it. ISB advice would be appreciated. Additionally, Peltier asked what CALFED could do with an extra \$1 million. During the June meeting we should have a presentation on "how additional funding could help CALFED".

This might be a very good time to establish a legacy environmental project for the federal administration. It may be a good time to get additional funding to jump start Delta programs.

Water Quality:

Review panel for *End of Stage One* water quality report and Informing Delta Vision: Grindstaff is concerned that water quality was not an important enough agenda item for the Delta Vision process. To address Grindstaff's concern, Healey suggests that the ISB write a follow up letter to the PPIC letter, specifically addressing water quality issues (tasked to Glaze). Healey is hoping to write a separate letter to the Task Force addressing in short terms the importance of water quality issues. Other reports will keep water quality an important issue, including the upcoming DOC paper from USGS. The CALFED water quality group continues with their *End of Stage One* review. Any intermediate products prior to final report can be useful for the Task Force as the final review will finish too late to help the Task Force. We also want to stress water quality issues on ecosystems as well as drinking water. The report will only cover drinking water issues.

Meyer: Let's not look exclusively at drinking water. This is a good time to address problems of looking at water quality only from a drinking water point of view.

Healey: Mercury and other reports coming will play a great role in keeping water quality in the forefront. We shall remind the Task Force that environment water quality should always be a part of the discussion. This is stressed in Glaze's letter.

Water Supply:

There's a court case noting that the Department of Water Resources (DWR) did not have the right permits to operate the pumps and take endangered species and they have 60 days to get the permits. CA Fish and Game did not advise DWR well on permitting process. We are currently trying to get all relevant agencies to work together on issue. DWR will not be able to get permits in time. Also OCAP decisions coming are probably going to go against the agencies. This will seriously question how processes have been implemented for the past several years. We may want to use the ISB for feedback on these issues.

Twiss: Sees court case as a step back in the short-run because it is species-specific. The judge didn't buy that the broader ecosystem restoration program provides benefits in the long run. Also, if things shut down in the short-run, it will mean that the new BDCP will have to be more robust and will need more science engagement.

Healey: The Science Program is being proactive, establishing a workshop to discuss what kind of a delta flow experiment would be needed to figure out more clearly the implications of flow patterns effecting delta smelt. Initial feedback was that we need flow in Old and Middle rivers (more then originally thought). We would like the ISB to look at our final product.

We've also been asked to clarify what is meant by a variable delta. We are developing a workshop with follow up experiment in Suisun bay/marsh that may let us evaluate how element of variable salinity may benefit delta smelt. We're also looking at past PSP grant applications to see if any that were highly rated but not previously funded could be revived. We hope to have a large open discussion workshop in May on what a variable delta would mean and get some broad feedback.

Other Updates:

The Delta Risk Management Strategy (DRMS) Independent Review Panel had an informational meeting in March. The panel is a top-notch group. The DRMS Phase 1 report is going to be late, so the review panel will not be able to review Phase 1 until July, rather than June as planned. The ISB really should not be reviewing the review, but rather should be commenting on "where do we go from here" or looking at what the Delta Vision Task Force should get out of the DRMS report. Phase 2 will continue without Phase 1 completion. Phase 1 is the risks. Phase 2 is the mitigation strategies for the risks highlighted in Phase 1.

CMARP III – The Science Program received a proposal from Sam Luoma to look at the monitoring programs of the implementing agencies and IEP to assess value of monitoring and whether additional monitoring is needed. Science Program staff is reviewing it now and may call on the ISB to help with report or peer review of the document. Meyer noted that it is directly related to performance measures and how monitoring is done. Healey accepts Meyer and Baptista volunteering to help.

ERP End of Stage 1 assessment: Many have been concerned that the ERP review was only on milestones and would not address performance of restoration and ERP outcomes. The Science Program will work close with ERP to see if they need help with their assessment. Eventually, there may be a technical review panel of the ERP.

Delta Regional Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Plan work is moving along. They held an Integration Workshop to discuss how things are fitting together. The conceptual models being produced look interesting and useful. Up to this stage models were independent, but they now looking at how the models will work together. Panel reviews of models are targeted for late May. ISB will get an update in June.

Performance Measures – Lauren Hastings gave an update. The retrospective analysis which is the Sue Garrett-Dukes report with performance tracking and financing stakeholder group will finalize their report by end of month. It is intended to be part of the End of Stage 1 report. The Science Program with the implementing agencies is

working on "prospective" report, out May 25 to ISB. That report will be presented to the BDPAC and Authority later in June. There was agreement that a technical panel should review the Phase I report and concern that the calendar was driving the product.

Ron Ott discussed work on Delta hydrodynamics and fisheries studies. In 1999 studies were implemented on hydrodynamics from Antioch to Hood. A couple pilot studies are also underway. The USGS and several agencies are pulling together a major proposal to understand the behavior of fish and the impacts of management decisions on fish in the delta to address the ROD question of whether a through delta model will work. A review panel will meet in June to evaluate the proposal. A multimillion dollar project and process will come out of it. ISB's role would be to look at the proposal after the review is complete. Baptista expressed some interest in looking at the set of models for hydrodynamics.

The next Science PSP Process will not occur until after the passing of the State budget. Once we have money, then we will decide how to proceed.

Information is out on the Fellows Solicitation so bring it to the attention of any qualified candidates.

The Science Program Strategic Plan has made as much progress as ISB. Healey has started writing out some thoughts, will work on it while he's in Japan.

ISB Vacancy — progressing slowly. May wait until the ISB has better defined its role.

Next Meeting: — June meeting, 2 day meeting 7-8.

Public Comment

Michael Warburton, Public Trust Alliance

His organization works to make sure enough clean water for public use for generations to come, and that the public controls its own trust resources and is party to planning for future use. He feels lucky to be at the ISB meeting where foresight and insight are used in public forums. He came to tell the ISB how lucky they are to be the science body advising CALFED. They may not think they're lucky because basic assumptions of CA water policy always (1) flows uphill to money, (2) ground and surface unconnected, (3) large volumes can be compressed to occupy same place a residential development, and (4) thermodynamics suspended for levees. So he's pushing for foresight/insight. His organization and the public want the ISB to help trustees see and use best knowledge of managing public resources in concert with long-term public interest.